

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 30-43 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Claim 30 is amended; and no claims are canceled or added herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 30-33, 35-37, 40 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,429,211 to Aulanko in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,957,243 to Root.

With respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

The applied art does not teach or suggest wherein a cage-side sheave supporting beam that is configured with a pair of beam members extending parallel to each other such that lower parts of right and left cage-side sheaves are disposed in a space therebetween, and the pair of right and left cage-side sheaves are rotatably supported by supporting means provided on an upper surface of the cage-side sheave such that said cage-side sheave supporting beam is disposed below rotational axes of the cage-side sheaves, and that an upper side surface of one of the pair of right and left cage-side sheaves is in a vicinity of a rear side wall of the upper beam and an upper side surface of the other of the pair of right and left cage-side sheaves is in a vicinity of a front side wall of the upper beam, as recited in Claim 30.

The features recited in amended Claim 30 assure that a clearance between the upper beam and the upper surface of the cage can be minimized, to reduce a top clearance when the cage is elevated to an uppermost position, as best shown in Figs. 1-3 and as discussed on page 11 of the present invention.

In contrast, the cage-side sheaves 30 of Root cannot be disposed in the vicinity of side-walls of the upper beam 20 since these sheaves are disposed below the sheave frame 32 and the upper beam 20. Please see Figs. 1 and 2a and Fig. 2b of Root. Aulanko does not make up for the deficiencies of Root.

Further, as shown in for example Fig. 3, a part 5b of the hoist rope 5 extending between the pair of right and left cage-side sheaves 16L, 16R, can be covered with the cage-side sheave supporting beam 15. In contrast, it is necessary in Root to use the complementary panels 44 that are used to prevent the ropes 24 from disengaging from the grooves of the sheaves 30.

In accordance with the features of the claimed invention and as best shown in Fig. 3, an angle between the upper beam 13 and the cage-side sheave supporting beam 15 when viewed from above can be minimized by disposing the upper beam and the cage-side sheaves 16L, 16R in a close manner.


For at least the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794

GJM:KMM\la
I:\ATTY\KMM\PROSECUTION WORK\26\268185\11-13-08 AMENDMENT.DOC